

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed March 17, 2006. In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 11, and canceled claims 2, 3, 7, 9, and 16-17. Claim 15 was previously canceled. By way of this amendment, no new matter has been added. Claims 2 and 9 were previously withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species and are now cancelled. New claim 22 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 11-14, and 18-22 are pending in this application. At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing rejections. Further, Applicant believes that there are also reasons other than those set forth below why the pending claims are patentable, and reserves the right to set forth those reasons, and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

### **Specification**

New paragraph [0016.1] has been included to briefly describe new Figure 2A. Paragraph [0030] has been amended to recite "Alternatively, liner 24 may be removable from propshaft 12." Support for this amendment may be found, at least, in originally filed claims 4 and 20.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the replacement drawings because in Figure 2 the cross hatch pattern of cardboard layer 26 is drawn so that it appears to be made of an elastomer, and not cardboard. Accordingly, Drawing sheet 1 has been replaced to include new Figure 2A, which is an enlargement of a portion of Figure 2 illustrating the surface and section graphics of Figure 2. Applicant specifically notes that the enlarged view of the crosshatch pattern of Figure 2 in Figure 2A clearly shows that the crosshatch pattern indicates a cardboard or paper material. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 4 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that claims 4 and 20 contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

When describing an invention to one of skill in the art, the presentation of “terms need only be reasonable with respect to the art involved; they need not inform the layman nor disclose what the skilled already possess. They need not describe the conventional. The intricacies need not be detailed ad absurdum.” *General Electric Company v. Brenner, Comr. Pats.*, 159 USPQ 335, 337 (CADC 1968). Furthermore, “[r]equiring inclusion in the patent of known scientific/technological information would add an imprecise and open-ended criterion to the content of patent specification, could greatly enlarge the content of patent specifications and unnecessarily increase the cost of preparing and prosecuting patent applications, and could tend to obfuscate rather than highlight the contribution to which the patent is directed. A patent is not a scientific treatise, but a document that presumes a readership skilled in the field of the invention.” *Ajinomoto Co. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 56 USPQ2d, 1332, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

The Examiner states that the “claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.” However, it is respectfully submitted that bonding processes and methods were known to one of skill in the art at the time the invention was made that would allow for removal of the bonded material. The Examiner’s attention is directed to exemplary patents U.S. Pat. No. 6,843,878 to Borg, and U.S. Pat. No. 5,061,183 to Nicholson which both illustrate that one of skill in the art at the time the invention was made would understand when reading the specification of the present application that while the liner may be bonded to a propshaft, it may also be removable from a propshaft. See Nicholson, at least at Col. 4, lines 13-19; and Borg, at least at Col.1, lines 32-38 and 45-46. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the specification is fully enabling of claims 4 and 20. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 7, 8, and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has re-written independent claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 7, including any intervening claims. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from newly amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 4-6, 8 and 10 are therefore in condition for allowance. Further, claim 11 has been amended to incorporate allowable subject matter of claim 7. Accordingly, independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12-14 and 18-21 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 22, including all of the limitations of base claim 11 and any intervening claims. Therefore new claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 3-6, 10-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 2,748,830, to Nash.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,135,553, to Evans.

Claims 11-14, 16 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated U.S. Patent 4,059,712, to Bothwell. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections over Nash, Evans and Bothwell.

As set forth above, independent claims 1 and 11 have both been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 7 therein. Accordingly, as stated by the Examiner, these claims define over the prior art. Further, claims 4-6, 8, 10, 13, 14, and 19-21 all depend from claims 1 or 11, and are therefore also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. If, however, there are any outstanding issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is earnestly encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 07-1360, under Order No. G00339, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: May 17, 2006

Jennifer M. Brumbaugh, Reg. No. 48,465  
Mick A. Nylander, Reg. No. 37,200  
GKN Driveline North America, Inc.  
3300 University Drive  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2362  
(248) 377-1200